

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully acknowledges receipt of the Office Action mailed July 30, 2002. In that Office Action, the Examiner entered an election of species requirement. In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's election requirement and requests reconsideration.

The Election Requirement

The Examiner has entered an election of species requirement, indicating that claims 1-34 and 44-51 are drawn to a first group (ceramic body); claims 35-38 are drawn to a second group (fiber-reinforced material); claims 39-43, 52-63, and 73-81 are drawn to a third group (method without the dip-coating of a fiber); and claims 64-72 are drawn to a fourth group (method with the dip-coating of a fiber). In regard to claims 44-51, Applicants have amended the preambles to correctly depend from a method (ultimately depending from claim 39), rather than a ceramic body. Applicants assert that this was a typographical error and does not constitute new matter.

As indicated above, Applicants respectfully withdraw from current consideration the unelected claims of Groups I and II without prejudice. The election of the species of Group III, including claims 44-51, is made by Applicants' attorney with traverse. In addition, Applicants request reconsideration of the claims of Group IV.

In making the restriction requirement, the Examiner has apparently ignored the generic nature of claim 39. Claim 39 is an independent claim, which is generic to both of the species of Groups III and IV identified by the Examiner. Dependent claims 38-63 and 73-81 are directed to the third species (method without the dip-coating of a fiber) and claims 64-72 are directed to the fourth species (method with the dip-coating of a fiber). The dependent claims depend from generic claim 39, which does not specify whether a fiber is dip-coated or not.

While the Examiner indicated that the claims are directed to two different species, the Examiner never argued that the two species require separate searches. Absent the need for separate searches, there is no logical reason to separate examination of the claims. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to give claims 39-81 consideration in the next Office Action or upon allowance of generic claim 39, Applicants request reconsideration of the claims of Group IV.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that they have fully responded to the Office Action. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, or otherwise feels it would be advantageous, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (713) 238-8043.

Respectfully submitted,



MARCELLA D. WATKINS
Reg. No. 36,962
Conley, Ross & Tayon, P.C.
P. O. Box 3267
Houston, Texas 77253-3267
(713) 238-8000
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

MARKED-UP VERSION OF AMENDMENTS

In the Claims:

44. (Once Amended) The [ceramic body] method of claim 43 wherein the carboxylate-alumoxane is the reaction product of a carboxylic acid and boehmite.

45. (Once Amended) The [ceramic body] method of claim 43 wherein the carboxylate-alumoxane is the reaction product of a carboxylic acid and pseudo-boehmite.

46. (Once Amended) The [ceramic body] method of claim 43 wherein the carboxylate-alumoxane is the reaction product of two or more carboxylic acids and boehmite.

47. (Once Amended) The [ceramic body] method of claim 46 wherein the carboxylate-alumoxane is the reaction product of the sequential reaction of two or more carboxylic acids with boehmite.

48. (Once Amended) The [ceramic body] method of claim 46 wherein the carboxylate-alumoxane is the reaction product of the parallel reaction of two or more carboxylic acids with boehmite.

49. (Once Amended) The [ceramic body] method of claim 46 wherein the carboxylate-alumoxane is the reaction product of the sequential reaction of a first carboxylic acid with boehmite to make a product, followed by the reaction of said product with a second carboxylic acid.

50. (Once Amended) The [ceramic body] method of claim 46 wherein the carboxylate-alumoxane is the reaction product of two or more carboxylic acids and pseudo-boehmite.

51. (Once Amended) The [ceramic body] method of claim 49 wherein the carboxylate-alumoxane is the reaction product of the sequential reaction of a first carboxylic acid with pseudo-boehmite to make a product, followed by the reaction of said product with a second carboxylic acid.